

Application Serial No. 10/584,009
Reply to office action of April 30, 2008

PATENT
Docket: CU-4897

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-13 are pending before this amendment. By the present amendment, claims 1-13 are amended; and new claims 14-15 are added. No new matter has been added.

Support for new claim 14 can be found in the specification, inter alia, in FIGs. 8-11.

Support for new claim 15 can be found in the specification, inter alia, in FIGs. 12-15.

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,874,222 (Lebaric). The "et al." suffix is omitted in a reference name.

The applicants respectfully disagree and submit that the claims, as they now stand, are in condition for allowance.

The examiner's attention is respectfully directed to the following limitations of -- the antenna element overlaps the apex and part of the tapered edge protrusion, and a portion of the antenna element extends linearly away from the PCB beyond the apex along the x-z plane, such that the antenna element is configured to provide an antenna electric field oriented along the x-z plane-- which are now required independent claim 1 and similar limitations are now required in claims 9 and 11.

In contrast to the presently claimed invention, Lebaric discloses a PCB 208 that has a unitary central stem monopole antenna device 300 that has a root 306 attached to a connecting pad 310 of the PCB 308, a stem 304 that extends away from the foot 206, and circular hat area 302 which is connected to the stem 304 in such a way that the

Application Serial No. 10/584,009
Reply to office action of April 30, 2008

PATENT
Docket: CU-4897

stem 304 and the circular hat area 302 are perpendicular to one another (e.g., See Lebaric col. 11, lines 36-67 and FIG 7). The office action uses Lebaric to teach a PCB 208 provided with a microstrip 214 and an antenna element 200 coupled to a portion of the microstrip line 214. The applicants note that Lebaric is silent regarding an antenna element that overlaps an apex and part of the tapered edge protrusion of a PCB.

Lebaric is also silent regarding a portion of the antenna element that extends linearly away from the PCB beyond the apex along the x-z plane of the PCB. Yet further, Lebaric is also silent regarding an antenna element which is configured to provide an antenna electric field oriented along the x-z plane of the PCB.

Accordingly, the applicants respectfully contend that Lebaric does not teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations now required in the independent claims 1, 9 and 11, as amended. In particular, the applicants respectfully contend that Lebaric does not teach or suggest, inter alia, -- the antenna element overlaps the apex and part of the tapered edge protrusion, and a portion of the antenna element extends linearly away from the PCB beyond the apex along the x-z plane, such that the antenna is configured to provide an antenna electric field oriented along the x-z plane-- the limitations or similar limitations now required in independent claims 1, 9 and 11, as amended.

It is well settled that in order to render an invention obvious, the cited prior art reference(s) must teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations. Accordingly, Lebaric cannot support an obviousness rejection to independent claims 1, 9 or 11 because Lebaric does not teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations contained therein. Therefore, the applicants respectfully contend that independent claims 1, 9 and 11 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the examiner withdraw this

Application Serial No. 10/584,009
Reply to office action of April 30, 2008

PATENT
Docket: CU-4897

obviousness rejection based on Lebaric to independent claims 1, 9 and 11.


Claims 2-8, 10 and 12-13 and new claims 14-15, ultimately depend upon their respective base claims, i.e., independent claims of 1, 9 and 11, and, as such, incorporate by reference all of the limitations contained therein. Therefore, claims 2-8, 10 and 12-15 are also believed to be in condition for allowance. Therefore, the examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this obviousness rejection based on Lebaric to dependent claims 2-8, 10 and 12-13.

For the reasons set forth above, the applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-13, and new claims 14-15 are now pending in this application, are in condition for allowance over the cited references. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and earnestly solicit an indication of allowable subject matter.

This amendment is considered to be responsive to all points raised in the office action. Should the examiner have any remaining questions or concerns, the examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to expeditiously resolve such concerns.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: AUGUST 28, 2008



Loren K. Thompson, Ph.D., Reg. No. 45,918
Ladas & Parry LLP
224 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 427-1300